

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 20 2006

REMARKS

The Non-Final Office Action mailed March 9, 2006 ("the Office Action") objected to claims 1, 23 and 29 stating that the claims should be amended to improve clarity. *Office Action*, p. 2. Claims 1, 23 and 29 have been amended as suggested.

Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-16 and 18-22 are Allowable

The Office Action rejected claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-16 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Claim 7 recites "the mediation server being independent of a communication link between callable devices." The Office Action asserts that the original specification fails to describe this feature. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the original specification does describe this feature. For example, at paragraph [0011] the specification states "ICM 12 may be logically separated from the various networks it supports." Paragraph [0013] states that "ICM 12 may include a mediation server 14." The specification describes various communication links between callable devices at paragraph [0040] and in FIG. 1. The specification also specifically refers to particular links including link 34 and link 36, which are described at paragraph [0014] and a wireless link, which is described at paragraph [0019]. Thus, the specification does describe the mediation server being independent of a communication link between callable devices. Claim 7 is therefore allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph. Claims 8, 10, 11, 13, and 14 are also allowable 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph since they were rejected because of their dependence from claim 7. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 15 stating that the original specification failed to described "without becoming an interconnect point." Claim 15 has been amended rendering the rejection moot. Claim 15 is therefore allowable. Claims 16 and 18-22 are also allowable since they were rejected because of their dependence from claim 15. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 13-16, 18-22, 24-27 and 29 are Allowable

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 13-16, 18-22, 24-27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,798,767 ("Alexander"). *Office Action*, p. 3. Alexander fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the independent claims 1, 7, 15 and 29.

Claim 1 recites associating an electronic device operable to receive a voice over internet protocol call with connection information, the connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule of the electronic device. The call receipt rule may be an internet protocol header rule (Claim 24), a real time transport protocol/real time control protocol rule (Claim 25), an allowable sample size rule (Claim 26), or a network access rule (claim 27), for example.

The Office Action asserts that Alexander discloses a call receipt rule of the electronic device in that Alexander discloses IP telephony devices having the capability of encapsulating a user's voice packets into IP packets so that the voice can be transmitted over LAN, WAN or Internet. *Office Action*, pp. 3-4. While Alexander may disclose that IP telephony devices can encapsulate a user's voice packets into IP packets, Alexander does not disclose a call receipt rule. On the contrary, where an IP device itself is doing the encapsulating demonstrates what one might refer to as a "call sending rule," that is, a rule that governs how the IP device sends data. In contrast, claim 1 refers to a call receipt rule and maintaining an information store including the call receipt rule. As recited in claim 2, maintaining the information store including the call receipt rule enables, among other things, responding to a query from a second device seeking the call receipt rule. The "call sending rule" of Alexander is thus distinct. Claim 1 is therefore allowable. Additionally, claims 24-27, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable at least in light of their dependence from claim 1.

Claim 7 recites a mediation server maintaining an information store, the mediation server being independent of a communication link between callable devices. Alexander does not disclose or suggest a mediation server maintaining an information store that is independent of a communication link between callable devices.

The Office Action asserts that Alexander discloses a mediation server that is not connected to the communication link between callable devices. However, the Office Action does not refer to any portion of Alexander which allegedly makes this disclosure. *Office Action*, p. 5. Applicant respectfully submits that Alexander does not disclose a call manager that is not connected to the communication link between callable devices. Rather, Alexander discloses that the call manager 26 sets up the call between a calling party and the target device. *Alexander*, Col. 4, lines 42-46. For example, FIG. 5A of Alexander describes the call manager either directing the call to an IP address of a called device, at blocks 206 and 220, and signaling the called device, at blocks 208 and 222; or sending a message to a gateway to indicate that a device is being called, at block 224. In each case, the call manager is sending messages or information as part of the communication link between callable devices. Further evidence that the call manager of Alexander is not independent of the communication link between callable device is found in that:

the call manager initiates calls, *Alexander*, column 4, line 63;

the call manager receives a call initiation request and sends a signal to the target IP telephone device offering the call to the telephony device, *Alexander*, column 6, lines 27-31, and column 10, lines 38-46; and

the call manager sets up the RTP audio and/or video stream between the IP telephony devices, *Alexander*, column 6, lines 47-50.

Thus, Alexander fails to disclose or suggest a mediation server maintaining an information store that is independent of a communication link between callable devices, as recited in claim 7. Therefore, Claim 7 is allowable. Claims 8, 11, 13 and 14 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 7.

Claim 15 recites querying a mediation server for the set of connection information, the mediation server maintaining a plurality of connection information sets for devices associated with a plurality of managed networks, the meditation server independent of each of the plurality of managed networks. The Office Action states that the call manager of Alexander discloses a mediation server that maintains a plurality of connection information sets for devices associated

with more than one managed network without becoming an interconnection point. *Office Action*, p. 6.

Applicant respectfully submits that the call manager of Alexander is associated with one of the IP networks of Alexander. For example, FIG. 1 discloses call manager 26a associated with LAN 20a, and call manager 26b associated with LAN 20b. Alexander discloses that call manager 26b may be eliminated. *Alexander*, column 4, lines 36-37. Alexander also discloses that a call manager may control all of the IP telephony devices of its own LAN and other LANs. *Alexander*, column 4, lines 32-34. However, Alexander does not disclose or suggest a mediation server independent of each managed network. Claim 15 is therefore allowable. Additionally, claims 16, and 18-22, are also allowable, at least in light of their dependence from claim 15.

Claim 29 recites connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule of each of the first plurality of electronic devices. As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Alexander does not disclose a call receipt rule. Thus, claim 29 is allowable.

Claims 2, 23 and 30-32 are Allowable

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 23 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0208185 ("Goodman").

Claims 2 depends from claim 1, which recites the connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule of the electronic device. Since neither Alexander nor Goodman disclose or suggest a call receipt rule, claim 2 is allowable, at least in light of its dependence from claim 1.

Independent claim 23 recites a query seeking appropriate connection information including an address for a called device and a call receipt rule of the called device. As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Alexander does not disclose or suggest a call receipt rule. Likewise, Goodman does not disclose or suggest a call receipt rule. For example, the dynamic dial plan of Goodman includes an identifier of a device and an address. *Goodman*, paragraph [0026], Table 1, and paragraph [0030]. Goodman does not disclose or suggest the dynamic dial plan including a call receipt rule. Therefore, claim 23 is allowable.

Claim 30-32 depend from claim 29, which recites the connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule. Since neither Alexander nor Goodman disclose or suggest a call receipt rule, claims 30-32 are allowable, at least in light of their dependence from claim 29.

Claims 5, 10 and 28 are Allowable

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 10 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0180646 ("Donley"). In rejecting claims 5 and 28, the Office Action relies on Alexander to teach the connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule of the electronic device, as recited by claim 1, from which claims 5 and 28 depend. As discussed above, Alexander does not disclose or suggest connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule of the electronic device. Likewise, Donley does not disclose or suggest connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule of the electronic device. Donley is directed to a presence aware network 100 with a plurality of communication devices 124a-n and 128a-n, each of which may be configured automatically with different sets of preferences based on which user is using the device. *Donley*, Abstract. The preferences of Donley describe user preferences and not a call receipt rule of the electronic device. Thus, claims 5 and 28 are allowable, at least in light of their dependence from claim 1.

Claim 10 depends from claim 7. Claim 7 recites the mediation server being independent of a communication link between callable devices. As discussed above, Alexander does not disclose or suggest a mediation server independent of a communication link between callable devices. In contrast to claim 7, Donley discloses a memory 140 that is within the telephony switch/server 108 within the communication link. *Donley*, Fig. 1, for example. Thus, Donley does not disclose or suggest a mediation server independent of a communication link between callable devices. Claim 10 is therefore allowable at least in light of its dependence from claim 7.

Conclusion

Applicant has pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-16, and 18-32.


Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

9-19-2006
Date


Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLE SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)